**Debate #1: Be it resolved that same sex couples not be allowed the right to parenthood**

**Jay (Pro) vs. Melanie (Con)**

For the pro side, Jay was agreeing with the statement that same sex couples should not be allowed the right to parenthood. His biggest argument was that a child needs both father and mother. If the child has homosexual parents instead of heterosexual parents the child would be exposed to homosexual activity from the parents. And based on his research children who have homosexual parent are 4 times more likely to become homosexual, assuming that homosexuality is acquired instead of born with. Thus Jay argued that homosexuals should not have right of parenthood.

On the other hand Melanie went against Jay’s stance by claiming that first; there are hardly any differences for a child to be grown by homosexual parent instead of heterosexual. Instead kids with two mothers tend to have better grades compared to normal kids. Second she said that religious scripts like the bible are outdated thus homosexuals should not be affected by the verses on the bible. She also said that the bible was written thousands of years ago which did not give the necessity to debate about the issues of homosexuality.

In general for this debate I believe that Jay won because he had a stronger argument compared to Melanie’s. His argument that a child needs both a mother and a father was stronger than that Melanie’s which was basically a belief that a child necessary does not need both mother and father. One thing that Jay could have said to Melanie was that how a child may be discriminated for having gay parents. The fact having gay parents will be a tag that a child could never repeal becoming a life-long burden for the child.

Personally I believe that same sex couples should not be allowed the right to parenthood. As mentioned previously this is not an issue only for the grownups but also for the children. Having two mothers or two fathers will remain as a tag for the children that will show up in their lives as they grow up. When these children grow up it is inevitable and clear that they will meet situation where they have to take their mothers or fathers and expose them to the society which is clearly a heavy burden for the children. Thus homosexual couples should not be allowed to adopt children for the sake of the children.

**Debate #2: Be it resolved that sexual orientation cannot be used as a basis for discrimination in housing, education or within the workplace.**

**Sarah & Lauren (pro) vs. Jennifer & Daniel (con)**

For the pro side Sarah and Lauren stated that sexual orientation cannot be used as a basis for discrimination in housing, education or within workplace. Their major argument was that discriminating based on sexual orientation is against human rights. They claimed that all men are equal and have the rights to feel comfortable and safe. They gave examples where homosexuals were discriminated by their sexual orientation. In 2003 a teacher in Texas got fired for being gay. And some people were beaten up by co-workers for being gay. Thus proving that discrimination based on sexual orientation is unjust.

For the con side Jennifer and Daniel claimed that discrimination is necessary. They claimed that in the military or in prison. In the military and prison people have shower in an all men or all women facility. Thus homosexuals will feel uncomfortable seeing everyone in naked. Another claim that the Jennifer and Daniel made was that homosexuality is not a genetic trait but an acquired trait. They said that people become gay due to gay experiences like rape. People like Hong Suk Cheon, a famous homosexual celebrity in Korea became gay after being raped by a homosexual.

Despite Jennifer and Daniel’s efforts it is clear that Lauren and Sarah have won this debate. The question was based on discrimination in housing, education or within workplace not in special environments like the military or the prison. Thus Jennifer and Daniel went off the topic which was a crucial error which made it clear that Lauren and Sarah have won the debate. Jennifer and Daniel could have mentioned about religion where some people do not like and feel comfortable with homosexuals have a belief that should not be ignored nor denied.

I personally believe that sexual orientation cannot be the basis for discrimination in housing, education and workplace. Just because people may be homosexuals that do not mean that they are incapable or are uninterested in pursuing the common goals in certain environments. These people want to learn want to earn money and to thrive just like everyone else. Thus it is wrong for people around homosexuals to discriminate homosexuals in housing, education or within workplace.

**Debate #3: Be it resolved that where numbers warrant, school boards must create a school for the exclusive use of transgender, gay and lesbian students.**

**Scott (pro) vs. Jun & Stephanie (con)**

For the pro side Scott debated that there should be schools for transgender, gay and lesbian students. His main argument was based on the happiness of the students. He claimed that homosexual students hear insults for being homosexual 26 times per day. However students who attended to schools for homosexuals did not have to go under the stress of being insulted. Thus these children were under a safe environment compared to ordinary public schools and were able to accomplish more academically because of the relieve of stress.

For the con side Jun and Stephanie argued that separating homosexuals from the non homosexuals is not the solution. They said that if the government creates a school for homosexuals then the government should also make buildings, hospitals, and other facilities which are certainly a burden for the budget. Another point that Stephanie and Jun made was that building schools for homosexuals may go against the will of some tax payers. For some Christians homosexuality is regarded as a sin, so building special schools homosexuals goes against their religion.

Though this debate was equally matched I believe that Scott has won the debate. Stephanie may have asked sharp questions like how graduating from a homosexual school will always be a tag for homosexuals but Scott was able to handle the question in a sharp way. Not only did Scott did well despite he was outnumbered, but also Jun made a crucial flaw in his ending where he missed out some major arguments and said things incorrectly thus I had to lift Scott’s hand up rather than Stephanie’s and Jun’s.

I personally believe that there should not be schools for transgender and homosexuals. Separating the homosexuals is not the answer. They might have a happier school life if they attend to schools for homosexuality; however the reality is not like their schools. Someday these students have to face reality and to adapt to the environment, but if they are not trained or not familiar of the environment during their high school life they will never be able to withstand the harsh reality that was hidden by schools for homosexuals. Thus I believe that schools for transgender and homosexuals may be good for a short period of time, but on the long run it is clear that these schools are merely a method of escaping reality instead of facing it.

**Debate #4: Be it resolved that priests and justices of the peace that refuse to marry same sex couples be charged with committing a hate crime. (this issue can only be debated within the context of a nation that already allows for same sex marriages).  
Ashley & Lisa (pro) vs. Sunny & Isaac (con)**

The pro side, Ashley and Lisa claimed that it is right for priests and justices of the peace that refuse to marry same sex couples be charged with committing a hate crime. They believed that it is the priest’s duty to fulfill marriages who wanted to get married. They also claimed that it would be a hate crime if the priests ignored the couples right to become happy and dislike these couples because of the verses in the bible.

For the con side, Sunny and Isaac believed that it is wrong for priests that refuse to marry same sex couples be charged for committing hate crimes. Their main argument was that it would unjust for ignoring the priests’ rights of religion. Clearly in the bible it says that homosexuality is banned. However making a priest whose job is to fulfill the words of the bible to conduct an act that goes against the bible is unethical. Therefore, they claimed that allowing marriages between homosexuals is an act that can get a priest into a lot of trouble. Thus priests should not be sentenced for hate crimes.

In general it was a great debate for both teams; however I have to say that the con side won this debate. First it was clear that the con side was much more prepared for the debate compared to the pro side. After the pro side’s speech Sunny was able to rebuttal every argument that the pro side had made during her opening speech. Another part that the con side did well was that they were able to mention the fact that allowing marriages for homosexuals can actually hurt the priest’s career, which the pro side did not mention. Thus the con side was able to win by showing more preparation for the debate.

As the con side said I think that priests should not be charged for hate crimes for not allowing marriages of homosexuals. Rather than the couple it is a bigger risk for the priests to go through. If priests have to allow homosexual couples to be married because if they do not it becomes a hate crime, is clearly going against a verse in the bible therefore ignoring one’s right of faith. However couples do not have to be married under a priest. Even if they believe in Christianity and still wanted to get married under a priest it will be contradicting since Christianity does not allow homosexuality. Therefore it would be clearly wrong for these priests who are merely doing their job and keeping their to be punished for not allowing homosexuals to get married.